

This judicial conversion of the interest into principal, has, in some respects, the appearance of allowing compound interest,

No! he would say 'his' refers the antecedent, if there be one; but the word *his* may well be placed so as to refer to a subsequent, as in the case of Mr. Frazier's directing his two executors out of his part of the estate, to educate his son John Alexander. From the proofs in the cause, and from reasonable suppositions, the account may stand as follows:

<i>A. Frazier, deceased, to John A. Frazier,</i>		<i>Dr.</i>
To one-half of the gross profits of the estate, from 9th May, 1779, to June 1790, 11 years 1 month, at £129 per ann.	£1,429 15s. 0d.	
To timber from my part, or one-half of the timber sold,	50 0s. 0d.	
	<u>£1,479 15s. 0d.</u>	
<i>Contra.</i>		
By one-half of the gross profits of the estate for 6 years, at the rate aforesaid,	£774 0s. 0d.	
By one-half of taxes, medicines, repairs, &c. &c. for 5 years, 1 month; that being the difference between the time of Alexander's holding the estate, and John's holding the estate, the repairs, being made chiefly by Alexander, at £24 per ann.	122 0s. 0d.	
By board, clothing, education, pocket money, physic, &c. for 8 years, at £45 per ann.	360 0s. 0d.	
By one-half of the gross profits of the estate, from the arrival at age of John to Alexander's death. It is not to be supposed, that if Alexander held the estate, after his brother's full age, he had less than one-half. The defect of proof must again be remarked. But say only £75 per ann. for 3 years, after John arrived at age, and was entitled to his estate,	225 0s. 0d.	
	<u>£1,481 0s. 0d.</u>	
By balance in favour of Alexander,	1 5s. 0d.	

On the whole, from the fullest investigation of this case; and on full deliberation, it does not appear to the Chancellor, that John A. Frazier's legal representatives have any just claim against the estate of Alexander Frazier. The Chancellor hath declared himself thus fully; because the grounds of his decision could not be obvious; and because he wishes, on every occasion, if possible, to reconcile to the losing party his determinations. There are, indeed, circumstances in this case, which required that he should explain himself; in order that one principle, at least, should be known to be established; (3 H. & J. 144, note.)

On the 2d of October, 1799, the auditor reported, that he had stated the claims exhibited against the estate of Alexander Frazier, deceased, amounting, on the 12th day of April, 1796, to £5,274 18s. 0d. including the claims of James Pattison, as heretofore stated and returned as account No. 1. And on those claims, he remarks, that Nos. 11, 13 and 15, are not proved; that Nos. 16 and 17 are proved, with an exception to allow any account standing against them on the deceased's books; that No. 12 is only a copy of a receipt exhibited as money paid to the said Alexander Frazier as attorney; but not proved by the claimant; and that No. 14 is a note of hand, given to Richard Ward, and proved by Zachariah Ward, who does not even state, that he is executor or administrator of Richard; the probate is also deficient.

The purchaser, Charles Williamson, by his petition, stated, that, under a persua-